

V 184185

SAN RAMON GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

ISSUES

April 1, 1984

James Hanafee, Chairman
David Arrieta
James Birmingham
Patricia Boom
Anthony Hurt
Richard Kono
Edward Lee
Wayne Lehman
Glenn Redden
Fred Staedel
Herman Welm

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

SEP 18 1985

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1950年1月23日
王德昭

CONTENTS:

I CHARGE AND COMMITTEE

II SUMMARY

A. AREA TO BE REVIEWED:

B. REVIEW THE EXISTING GENERAL PLAN:

1. INTRODUCTION:
ACCURACY
APPROPRIATENESS
2. LAND USE:
ISSUES
3. HOUSING:
ISSUES
4. CIRCULATION:
ISSUES
5. OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION:
ISSUES
6. PUBLIC SAFETY:
ISSUES
7. SEISMIC SAFETY:
ISSUES
8. NOISE ABATEMENT:
ISSUES
9. SCENIC ROUTES:
ISSUES
10. PARKS AND RECREATION/COMMUNITY FACILITIES:
ISSUES
11. HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES:
ISSUES

III APPENDIX:

A. COUNCIL CHARGE

B. TASK GROUPS

I CHARGE AND COMMITTEE:

CHARGE FROM SAN RAMON CITY COUNCIL TO GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE:

"REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF A CITY GENERAL PLAN, AREA GENERAL PLAN, AND RECOMMENDATION OF A SPHERE OF INFLUENCE (SOI)FOR THE CITY OF SAN RAMON."

This request was placed on an eleven person committee appointed by San Ramon City Council represented by Council Members Jerry Ajlouny and Mary Lou Oliver in October, 1983.

The eleven committee members were appointed by the Council after formal written applications and, most important, represent a cross section of San Ramon. The specific charge to the Committee by the City Council is in appendix A. As the scope of the charge evolved and influences outside the City developed the initial charges changed somewhat. To accomplish the basic objectives and adjust to the realities of the original charges ten tasks were outlined. Each member of the committee was in charge of a specific task and all committee members participated in at least three task groups. The ten task groups and the task leader of each task group is in Appendix B.

II SUMMARY

A. AREA TO BE REVIEWED:

The area reviewed will be described in detail in the final report. In essence it is the City of San Ramon and some of the surrounding area. The extent of the surrounding area varies with the topography and likely impacts on the City. To the West the area extends to the County Boundary. To the South the area extends well past Highway 580 into Pleasanton to include the extensive commercial developments. To the North Bollinger Canyon is included as the only access to the canyon area is through the City. Small portions to the North and large areas to the East are included as any development of such areas will have major impacts on the quality of life in San Ramon.

B. REVIEW THE EXISTING GENERAL PLAN:

1. INTRODUCTION: The existing general plan is the "San Ramon Valley Area General Plan" approved by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on May 24, 1977. We have reviewed this plan and find that it was suitable for the unincorporated area a decade ago, but it is completely inadequate for the present and future of the City of San Ramon. It is out-dated and lacking in several major aspects.

For example, the existing plan deals in a general way with light traffic and three major roads. The present reality is heavy traffic, and the need to plan in great detail the traffic flow on several major roads, arterials and collector streets. The housing element in the existing plan includes the entire Valley. The City of San Ramon must have a housing element specific to the City. The land use element of the existing plan describes in a broad brush manner industrial development and housing density. This was suitable for county, but there have been encroachments on the original intent. More important, there are severe pressures to develop to the highest density possible the remaining land in and surrounding San Ramon. This would have a substantial negative impact on the quality of life in San Ramon. A general plan for the City of San Ramon would provide clearer guidance on housing density, open space, conservation, and protect the quality of the City.

The existing plan does not adequately address public facilities, libraries, community and neighborhood parks. The City of San Ramon is woefully lacking in all these areas. There is nothing in the existing general plan to guide the City in adjusting to an employment center in its midst of some 26,000 people. It describes the lands to the East as open space, but yet there are plans for several thousand homes.

Thus the existing general plan for San Ramon is no longer appropriate or adequate for the City. A plan representing the goals, ideals and needs for the present and future residents is required.

2. LAND USE:

ISSUES

- a. Should ridgelines and slopes be preserved?
- b. Should a slope ordinance be considered?
- c. Should the Dougherty Hills area designated "special concern area 2" in the existing general plan remain an area of special concern?
- d. Should Bollinger Canyon be an area of special concern?
- e. Should the area on the West side of Highway 680 be treated an area of special concern?
- f. Should the City have a central business district?
- g. How and to what extent should the area east of San Ramon be developed?
- h. Should special consideration be given to preserving flat land for parks?



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124879590>

i. Should the City designate park land in the general plan?

j. What is the proper balance of land use between housing, commercial, park, open space and circulation issues?

3. HOUSING

ISSUES

a. Should the City be responsible for providing adequate housing to accomodate the anticipated employment growth in the Tri-Valley Area?

b. If so, should the City permit the maximum density possible on the available land sites to achieve this end?

c. Should the City maximize housing unit densities at certain locations to provide lower cost housing?

d. Should "buildable" land (excluding all ridgelines) be defined as only that land with zero to 15% slope?

e. Should housing unit densities be maximized at the expense of the present relatively low density single family character of the Planning Area?

f. As an alternative to higher density housing, should development be allowed on the slopes steeper than 15% or on the ridgelines?

g. Should housing be built on all available flatland at the expense of parks and recreation facilities?

h. Should the City pay specific attention to publicly sponsored programs or subsidies to achieve a balance of low income-housing?

4. CIRCULATION

ISSUES

a. Bollinger Canyon Road Extension east of Alcosta Boulevard.

b. Dougherty Road as a Major Arterial.

c. Alcosta Boulevard as an Arterial.

d. Extension of Broadmoor Drive to Bollinger Canyon.

e. Southern Pacific Railroad Right-Of-Way.

- f. Expansion of the Traffic Management System Concept.
- g. Limiting the Width and the Aesthetics of Crow Canyon.
- h. Future Rights-Of-Way Aesthetics.
- i. Bike Trails
- j. I-680 interchanges within the City of San Ramon.

5. OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION

ISSUES

A. A concern for the preservation of rural areas to the east encompassing the Dougherty Hills area and Tassajara Valley which may conflict with proposals for large scale developments in the area.

b. A concern over the likely conflict of residential land use with the preservation of stream courses and riparian habitat in the portions thus far developed.

c. A concern over the potential conflict of further development with preservation of hillsides and ridgetops in their natural state.

d. A concern over the lack of effective measures to establish "green space" areas, open space, trails, green belts and park land in the San Ramon area. Also a concern for lack of resources to maintain these open spaces.

e. A concern over the likely conflict between the current development plans for the Study Area and the quality of the air we breathe.

f. The presumption that San Ramon must sacrifice the open space and potential park land, particularly flat land, to provide for a preplanned average housing density.

6. PUBLIC SAFETY

ISSUES

a. Is the Public Safety element in the existing general plan applicable to the City of San Ramon?

b. Should the City have a single agency to provide for public safety such as fire protection and ambulance service?

7. SEISMIC SAFETY

ISSUES

a. The applicability of the Seismic Safety element in the existing general plan to the City of San Ramon.

8. NOISE ABATEMENT

ISSUES

a. Is the traffic noise adequately addressed in the existing general plan?

b. Is the aviation noise adequately addressed in the existing general plan?

c. Should limitations be put on community noise?

d. Should special consideration be given to noise from Camp Parks?

9. SCENIC ROUTES

ISSUES

a. Should there be roads designated as scenic routes?

b. If so, what roads should be designated scenic routes:

c. What characteristics should be applied to the scenic routes.

10. PARKS AND RECREATION/COMMUNITY FACILITIES

ISSUES

a. Are public facilities in the City of San Ramon for community activities, the performing arts, meeting rooms for civic and youth groups and other such community programs adequate?

b. Are community and neighborhood parks in the City of San Ramon adequate?

c. Is there suitable land available for parks for the present and projected needs of the citizens of San Ramon?

d. Are there sufficient parks available to accommodate the projected 25,000 employees adjacent to San Ramon and their recreational programs?

e. Is the land dedicated by developers suitable for the park needs of San Ramon?

f. Are the fees from developers in lieu of park land dedication reasonable?

g. Is the funding adequate to maintain the parks?

h. Should San Ramon continue to be served by several park districts?

i. Should San Ramon seek control over Vista San Ramon and any similar park land in close proximity to the City which is suitable for community and neighborhood parks?

11. HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ISSUES

a. Child Care

b. Community Facilities

c. Employment/Training/Education

d. Hospital/Health Services

e. Emergency Shelter Services

f. Substance Abuse and Mental Health

g. Transportation

h. Should the City have health and human resources as an element in the General Plan?

SAN RAMON GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN: JAMES HANAFEE
OCTOBER 11, 1983

TASK 1: Define the Areas to be Reviewed
Task Leader: Glen Redden

TASK 2: Review the Existing General Plan for Accuracy and Appropriateness
Task Leader: Richard Kono

TASK 3: Land Use
Task Leader: James Birmingham
Members: Glenn Redden
Anthony Hurt
Fred Staedel
Edward Lee

TASK 4: Circulation
Task Leader: Herman Welm
Members: Richard Kono
Wayne Lehman
David Arrieta

TASK 5: Housing
Task Leader: Anthony Hurt
Members: James Hanafee
Patricia Boom

TASK 6: Conservation and Open Space
Task Leader: Edward Lee
Members: Hermann Welm
Glenn Redden
Fred Staedel
James Birmingham

TASK 7: Public Safety and Seismic Safety
Task Leader: Wayne Lehman
Members: Richard Kono
Patricia Boom
David Arrieta

TASK 8: Noise Abatement and Scenic Highway
Task Leader: Fred Staedel
Members: Anthony Hurt
James Hanafee

TASK 9: Parks and Recreation/Community Facilities
Task Leader: David Arrieta
Members: Wayne Lehman
Glenn Redden
Edward Lee
Herman Welm

TASK 10: Health and Human Resources
Task Leader: Patricia Boom
Members: Richard Kono
James Birmingham

CHARGE
TO
GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

SUBJECT

REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF A CITY GENERAL PLAN, AREA
GENERAL PLAN, AND RECOMMENDATION OF A SPHERE OF INFLUENCE
(SOI) FOR THE CITY OF SAN RAMON.

FROM
SAN RAMON CITY COUNCIL

- I. Define the area to be reviewed.
 - A. Within the city
 - B. Surrounding areas with impact on existing city services and future services.
- II. Review the existing general plan for
 - A. Accuracy
 - B. Appropriateness
- III. Develop a City General Plan as well as an Area General Plan, including the following elements.
 - A. Land Use/Zoning
 1. Residential
 2. Commercial
 3. Industrial
 4. Retail
 - B. Open space/Conservation
 - C. Transportation/Circulation
 - D. Housing
 - E. Public Safety
 - F. Seismic Safety
 - G. Parks and Recreation/Community Facilities
 1. Health and Human Resources
 - H. Noise Abatement
 - I. Scenic Highway
- IV. Determine geographical areas of specific concern.
- V. Recommend a Sphere of Influence for San Ramon.
- VI. Recommend areas for future annexation and recommend a calendar for such annexation.
- VII. Provide a published report of the committee's recommendations.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124879590